

**FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

**And**

**FALLBROOK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 October 2009, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

**MINUTES**

Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM by Mr. Jim Russell, who led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

14 members were present, Anne Burdick, Jean Dooley, Donna Gebhart, Tom Harrington, Ron Miller, Roy Moosa, Steve Smith, Paul Schaden, Harry Christiansen, Jack Wood, Michele Bain, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney and Jim Russell. Bill Bopf had resigned.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Groups jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item.

**NONE.**

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 17 & 24 August and 21 September 2009. Voting item.

Ms. Bain corrected her motion of August 24. **Ms. Dooly motioned to approve all of the minutes as corrected and the Group unanimously approved the motion.**

3. P82-069 W3 Request for a Modification to the Major Use Permit for the Grand Tradition located at 1602 S. Mission Road. Owner Earl & Beverly McDougal 728-6466 – X102. Applicant and Contact person Don McDougal 728-6466- X102. County planner Diane Shalom 858-694-3721. Continued at the 20 November 2006 FCPG meeting and withdrawn by the applicant at the 17 Dec 2007 FCPG meeting. **Land Use.** Community input. Voting item. (7/29)

Mr. Don McDougal presented the request for approval of a Major Use Permit to cover the Arbor Terrace wedding facility on the Grand Tradition grounds.

Mr. Wood reported that the Land Use Committee had reviewed the request and noted that DPLU had a few conditions that needed to be met prior to County approval.

**Mr. Harrington motioned that the project be approved as presented subject to all of DPLU's concerns being met and the Group unanimously approved the motion.**

4. Continuing workshop on the Fallbrook Community Plan as created by the community and the Planning Group in 2005/2006. The Planning Group is considering a general commercial category on certain parcels of the Grand Tradition property and if approved it would be incorporated into the Fallbrook Community Plan. County planner Eric Lardy 858-694-2457, eric.lardy@sdscounty.ca.gov. **Primary topic will be the Grand Tradition vis-à-vis the Commercial Regional Category and the possible impact on the surrounding residential neighborhoods.** Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Russell outlined the history behind this consideration. The problem was that the previous administration of DPLU had agreed to apply a special category of General Commercial zoning to the Grand Tradition property. However the administration changed and the new administration would not recognize any special zoning within a category. Therefore DPLU and Fallbrook Planning Group representatives (Jim Russell, Harry Christiansen and Jack Wood) had produced the proposed modification to the Fallbrook Community Plan.

Mr. McDougal stated that while he understood the concern, after meeting with his family he could not support the modification. He stated that while the property was doing well as a wedding venue now he could not look into the future and say that would always be the highest and best use of the property. He requested that the Planning Group not request the change to the Community Plan.

Mr. Christiansen noted that the Grand Tradition Property is virtually surrounded by residential property and allowing unbridled commercial development in that area would be **very** bad for the community.

Mr. Moosa stated that he had concerns with singling out an individual property and tailoring specific development restrictions for that parcel. Mr. Russell stated that the same procedure is being undertaken in Valley Center with the Bates Nut Farm. Ms. Heyneman asked how the 60,000 square foot total development limitation was arrived at and Mr. Russell stated that **the** representative team wanted something less than then 100,000 square feet and greater than 50,000 square feet. He further stated that if Ms. Heyneman had a number in mind **to** please offer it up for consideration. Ms. Heyneman suggested **the** number 80,000 square feet be utilized. After further discussion **Mr. Wood motioned to approve the Modification to the Fallbrook Community Plan (as described below) with the modification of the maximum square footage for the entire site being 80,000 Square feet. The Group approved the motion 14 to 1 with Mr. Moosa abstaining.**

**Issue LU2.2a Additional commercial categories beyond those provided for in the County's General Plan are needed to address circumstances specific to the Fallbrook Community.**

**Goal LU2.2a The creation of additional commercial land use categories which specifically address the needs of the Fallbrook Community.**

**Policy LU2.2a1 APNs 104-250-34, 104-250-35, 104-350-14, and 106-410-36 contain The Grand Tradition. In this iteration of the Fallbrook Community Plan a Category of Commercial was placed on those parcels to facilitate that business (The Grand Tradition) and only that business. It is primarily a wedding venue for group activities with a reservation, with an outdoor/indoor commercial area with three separate facilities: the Beverly Mansion (15,000 SF), Arbor Terrace (5,000 SF) and a third site yet to be constructed, Tuscany/Vineyard (5,000 SF), plus the possibility of a future hotel to support those group activities. In this case, the total square footage permitted for the entire 22 acre venue shall be 80,000 SF. If the business of The Grand Tradition ceases to exist on these parcels the Regional Category will revert to residential with .5 acre zoning.**

5. **Note: THE FCPG WILL NOT HEAR THE MEADOWOOD PROJECT THIS MONTH (PUT OFF UNTIL NOVEMBER) DUE TO THE RECEIPT OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CAMPUS PARK PROJECT.** The Meadowood Project; GPA 04-002, SP 04-001, REZ 04-004, TM 5354, S04-005, S04-006, S04-007, MUP08-024. Review the General Plan Amendment & Specific Plan Amendment for the Meadowood Project located on the 866 acres just north of SR-76 approximately ¼ mile east of I-15. Last month we reviewed and commented on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). This month we will be reviewing and commenting on the project. Contact person: Jimmy Ayala, Community Development Director, Pardee Homes, 858-794-2500 or [Jimmy.Ayala@pardeehomes.com](mailto:Jimmy.Ayala@pardeehomes.com). County planners Dennis Campbell DPLU Project Manager, 858-694-3737 **Land Use, Circulation, Public Facilities, Parks & Recreation and Design Review Committees.** Community input. Voting item. (8/28)  
**NOT HEARD CONTINUED.**

6. ZAP86-010W2 Request for a parking prohibition for the new Fallbrook Library for sight distance from the parking lot on a portion of Fig and Alvarado streets. County planner Dahvia Lynch, Dept of General Services, 858-694-2047, [dahvia.lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:dahvia.lynch@sdcounty.ca.gov). Circulation Committee. Community input. Voting item. (9/24)

Mr. Dave Timber and Ms. Dahvia Lynch of General Services presented the request to restrict parking along a portion of Fig and Alvarado in the vicinity of the new entrances to the Fallbrook Library. The restriction would be approximately 100 feet on either side of the driveways. Mr. Niel Areight of the Department of Public Works explained the need for the restriction do to sight distance concerns.

Mr. Vince Ross, representing the Fallbrook Business Association, stated that several downtown businesses had concerns about losing any parking spaces.

Mr. Russell clarified the request as a safety issue and that it appeared to be a requirement of **the** new Library project.

Mr. Christiansen informed the Group that the Circulation Committee had heard the request. He stated that while the condition of parking adjacent to driveways was prevalent all over the town and while this type of restriction would be devastating to local businesses if enforced in every similar condition, the Circulation Committee had voted unanimously to approve the request.

Ms Heyneman asked why Fig Street had similar restrictions to Alvarado when it had much **less** traffic. Mr. Aeight explained that the sight distance requirements are current minimum standards for any new construction.

Mr. Harrington re-stated Mr. Russell's point that this was a safety concern. Additionally the Library project had already provided funds to pave the large dirt lot just east of the current library building that would provide over 50 new parking spaces in a much safer environment.

**After further discussion Mr. Harrington motioned that the Parking prohibition be adopted as presented and the Group unanimously approved the motion.**

7. Recertification of the speed limit on South Mission Road from 600 feet south of Pepper Tree Lane north to Hill Street. County planner: Maria Rubio-Lopez, DPW Traffic Engineering (858) 874-4030. Circulation Committee. Community input. Voting item. (9/29)

Mr. Christiansen presented the request from the Department of Public Works for the Planning Group to support the 35 mile per hour speed limit over this segment of Mission Road. After limited discussion, **Mr. Christiansen motioned to approve the recertification and to request that additional 35 mph signs be installed. The motion passed unanimously.**

8. Review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Campus Park Project. We will comment on the project at the December 2009 FCPG meeting. SPA03-008/TPM5338RPL4/GPA03-04/SP03-004/R03-014. Proposed Specific Plan Amendment with a proposed Tentative Map, a proposed General Plan Amendment and a proposed Rezone for the development located north of SR-76 and east of I-15. This request proposes 521 Single Family Dwelling Units and 555 Multi-Family Dwelling Units on 159.2 acres, 157,000 s.f. of Office Professional on 11.5, 61.200 s.f. of commercial on 8.1 acres, 3.4 acres of Parks, an 8.5 acre active sports park, 173.2 to 175.8 acres of Open Space Preserve, plus more. Owner/ applicant PASSERELLE LLC 619 696-7355. Contact person David S. Davis 619-696-7355, WinWood-davis@msn.com. County planner Campbell 858-505-6390. Project was continued at the 17 Nov 2003 FCPG meeting, withdrawn at the 18 Dec 2006 FCPG meeting and denied at the 17 November 2008 FCPG meeting. County planner Dennis Campbell, 858-505-8380, [Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov). Comments on the DEIR are due by 16 November 2009. The DEIR(s) and the General Plan Amendment and the Specific Plan Amendment can be viewed at the Fallbrook, Vista and Valley Center Libraries. Additionally they can be found at [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa\\_public\\_review.html](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html). **Land Use, Circulation, Public**

**Facilities, Design Review, and Parks & Recreation Committees.** Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Tim Brown and Mr. David Davis presented the DEIR and focused on a few of the highlights. Both felt the DEIR had done a good job of addressing the impacts that the project would have on the community. They stated that the median lot size would be just over 6000 square feet. Mr. Wood stated that the Land Use Committee had reviewed the DEIR and felt the **finds???** were inadequate in several categories. The Committee felt that the school site was not located correctly; the lots were too small and the grading too extensive. Additionally, the 10,000 daily trips **reported in the** traffic impact study did not come close to addressing the 70,000 daily trips estimated to be generated when the area is built out. Mr. Wood stated that while the study did not present any real alternatives, that the Biological sensitive reduced footprint was the only close alternative.

The Land Use Committee voted unanimously to approve the following comments:

1. A school site should be established in the Campus Park project within the Fallbrook Union Elementary School District.
2. Grading is excessive, leaving steep slopes and changing the topography drastically.
3. Density is too great with lots as small as 4,000 SF, 15' setbacks, 5' side yards.
4. Parking is inadequate.
5. Biological Reduced Footprint, Alternative #4 is preferred.

Mr. Christiansen stated that the **Circulation Committee** had reviewed the DEIR and found the traffic section **inadequate**. The report needs to address the cumulative daily trips of all the developments **in the quadrant** and **should include a study** of the effects on traffic if an interchange at Stewart Canyon **were to be** constructed.

Mr. Christiansen reported that the **Circulation Committee** found the DEIR to be deficient in that the studies do not consider the volume of traffic going north nor do they consider the need for a northern egress from the quadrant. Mr. Christiansen urges the County to consider applying the TIF fees from all the projects in the quadrant to a future I-15 Interchange in addition to other local area improvements. Further, the DEIR's assessment of the cumulative impact does not satisfactorily address the full impact of all the proposed developments in the quadrant. These developments, once completed, will be the equivalent of an entire new town which will have a cumulative impact far beyond anything described by this DEIR.

Ms. Anne Burdick reported that the **Public Facilities Committee** had reviewed the report and had the following concerns:

### **FLOODING**

#### **Potential Impacts with Flooding and Storm Drain Capacity**

(4-16 & 17) "...residential lots, roadway/utility corridors and other appropriate sites/facilities would be elevated above the 100-year storm flood water elevations."

No information is included about heights of elevation and visual impacts.

No information is included on effects of dwelling units being in the flood plain?

How are homeowners going to be impacted? What is the effect on insurance rates?

"Project development will constrict flood plain in southern portion of the site, raising water surface by 4.4' and extending flood plain further within Campus Park West"

What is Campus Park West planning for that area - and how will those floodwaters be handled?

Why will Campus Park agree to these conditions?

**Raised embankments functioning as levees.** Letter included in Appendix L (immediately prior to Stormwater Management Plan) from US Department of Transportation indicates that embankments should not act as a flood control structure. Why is this letter included? Did Campus Park request certification by the DOT that the embankments could be part of your flood management plan?

Would like more information on this.

Lake Henshaw Dam Inundation Map - (Figure 4.2.3-1)

Shows severe flooding of Multi-Family areas 1 & 4.

No information is included with this map. What is the likelihood of this inundation?

What steps can be taken to protect against this?

Detention Basin for storm flows (4-17)

Few details are included - how constructed? how deep? volumes? visual impact?

Runoff from the Hydrological Basins. (Appendix L, p. 8)

all runoff "exits project site at Node 348" but no map shows Node 348.

Would like to see a single map that clearly shows all flows, including Horse Ranch Creek

**WATER**

**Water and Wastewater issues need to be considered for ALL projects in the I-15/76 area before selecting any single project for approval.**

**Demonstrate that adequate water is available on a sustainable basis and that project approval does not have a negative impact on existing water users, both for imported supplies and current groundwater supply. (FCPG commented in November 2008 that water and sewer issues were not adequately addressed.)**

All data on water supply included in the EIR is outdated.

The delta smelt decision (2007) IS mentioned, and a long discussion is included on state and county water conditions as a result of that, but no analysis is included of current conditions in Fallbrook or at the Rainbow MWD.

Desalination is mentioned (4-55) as an option for additional water (because of the new Carlsbad plant) but Project needs to realistically assess how likely that availability is. How much of that water is already allocated to other areas?

Anticipates that drought will be over before they begin construction (4-59)

Since they do not address the water issues if the drought is NOT over, do we assume that the Project will not proceed until drought is over?

Water availability letter dated 7/21/08 indicates that water "reasonably expected" to be available.

But this information is based on a 2002 study by the SDCWA which is clearly outdated.

Need to include more current information - Rainbow is currently under a moratorium for both water & sewer

Appendix I - Water Supply Assessment prepared by Rainbow MWD is based on 2005 data. Project needs to conduct a new Water Supply Assessment which would consider drought conditions, conditions once the drought eases and/or conditions once the drought ends.

**WASTEWATER**

Need current information on availability of EDU's (because of current moratorium at RMWD)

Sewer Availability letter, July 2008, indicates that wastewater facilities for the Project are NOT available.

Campus Park's Wastewater Treatment Option 2 - the additional 328 EDU's beyond the 850 supplied by Rainbow will be sent to the proposed Meadowood WWTP.

This option calls for a storage pond. (Appendix I, p. 5-7 - describes it as a "percolation pond to dispose of all treated effluent.")

Details need to be added: what are the characteristics of the water quality in that pond? How long will it be full?

Will it be covered? How will it impact the adjoining areas?

New County rules prohibit percolation ponds that would affect groundwater, stormwater runoff, or waterways. Since the proposed percolation pond is next to Horse Ranch Creek and the San Luis Rey River, the percolation pond is likely to be prohibited.

Project needs to obtain something in writing that indicates a percolation pond would be permitted.

And what will be the alternative for the additional EDU's if Meadowood does not obtain a wastewater treatment plant?

### **SCHOOL**

The cumulative impact on Fallbrook schools is enormous. (4-64)

2,167 elementary /middle school students

1,015 high school students

How will the school districts accommodate this huge increase in the student population?

Paying a fee doesn't seem sufficient mitigation for the disastrous effects on our schools.

Elementary school enrollment data is based on 2005 numbers, therefore not currently valid. (4-71)

Campus Park's Contribution: 367 elementary students and 189 high school students.

Campus Park's contribution alone will put the area schools over capacity, (even based on the outdated 2005 numbers) not to mention the other projects in the NE quadrant. (4-71 and 4-72)

Campus Park should establish a school site within the Fallbrook Elementary School boundary for grades K through 8, to be located in the Professional Office 2 area, (8.8 acres) plus additional acreage from Professional Office 1 to bring the total acreage to at least 10 acres. Campus Park must provide a school since it is the only residential project in the quadrant to currently have water and sewer, and is therefore likely to be the first project completed. We support the Fallbrook Elementary School District in its request for full mitigation.

### **FIRE PROTECTION**

Response time goal is 5 minutes once roads are improved. App J indicates that "travel time is found to be 5.13 minutes which is... generally consistent with General Plan Public Facilities Element requirements."

A Ladder truck is only available at Pala Reservation, but not if it is needed elsewhere.

Estimated response time to a structure fire (with ladder truck) is 15 minutes. (Same for a vegetation fire.)

The following items from Appendix J should be added to the Fire section:

"Response to a structure fire *requires* (not "would include") two engine companies, a ladder truck, and a Battalion Chief." (per Hunt Research Study – Appendix J)

"The Ladder truck comes from the Pala Reservation. This is not a guaranteed response, if there is a fire at the Reservation or if the apparatus is in use elsewhere. The NCFPD does not have an Aerial Ladder truck.....that can access a roof or window over 30 feet high."

Appendix J also states that "...the Fire District may be required to upgrade....to include an Aerial Ladder Truck.... The upgrades should be done in conjunction with several other projects.... Several developments in the area will be required to upgrade various improvements with the Fire District.

Prior to final map an agreement to provide these facilities and equipment shall be in place for required improvements. (pp 3-4)

The letter in Appendix J from Fire Marshall Paul Dawson (DPLU) also indicates that "all roads serving the project from NCFPD Station 4 and within must be completed prior to building permit issuance." This should also be included in the body of the EIR

With no mention of resolving the ladder truck issue, how can the Project conclude that impacts to fire protection services would be less than significant (4-72) if they have buildings over 30 feet?

### **POLICE PROTECTION**

Current response time is 8 minutes for priority calls and 16 minutes for non-priority calls.

Current average response time to the Project site is 23 minutes and 35 minutes.

Adequate response time cannot be guaranteed.

The DSEIR concludes that "A new station would mitigate these effects.....therefore no impact."

What proposals are being considered in the event that a new station is not built?

### **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative. Total of 645 dwelling units. 390 SF, 255 MF



This Alternative would remove Multi-Family housing from the west side of Horse Ranch Creek Road (eliminates MF 1 and 4)

Multi-Family residential uses abutting riparian habitat west of Horse Ranch Creek Road would be eliminated. No development along Highway 76. Fewer impacts to most sensitive habitats  
Preferred alternative for biological resources, visual quality, traffic, air quality and noise.

Would meet all proposed objectives except fewer houses (objective 3)

The Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative would eliminate all residential units in the flood plain (and also the utilities and roads?)

The total dwelling units in this Alternative would more closely match the Project's sewer availability.

This Alternative would place less demand on the water supply.

This Alternative would have less impact on school overcrowding:

Multi-Family 1 = 192 DUs would be eliminated

Multi-Family 4 = 108 DUs would be eliminated

This would eliminate approximately 125 elementary students (34% less than the Proposed Project) and 60 high school students (32% less than the Proposed Project).

Ms. Eileen Delaney reported that the **Design Review Committee** had reviewed the report and had the following concerns:

According to the Fallbrook Community Plan:

"Community plans, adopted as an integral parts of the County of San Diego's General Plan, are policy plans specifically created to address the issues, characteristics, and visions of communities within the County. These distinct communities each have a distinct physical setting with a unique history, culture, character, life style, and identity.

Used in conjunction with the General Plan, a community plan is a key tool to identify development that positively contribute to its character and should be conserved, as well as the location, scale, and design of desired new land uses, and community facilities. The Plan's policies require that development be comparable to, or transition with, existing development to ensure that new development "fits" with the community and enhances the community's vision. "

With this in mind, the projects scheduled for the I-15/Highway 76 corridor including the Campus Park Project are high density urban projects, which completely ignore the character of Fallbrook or the sensibilities of its residents. The projects impose small lot residential areas along with industrial looking rectangular commercial buildings on an area that has a long agricultural history and a uniqueness which has been ignored by the developers. The size and design of these projects mirror the same exact size and design that can be seen throughout Irvine and Temecula. The developers have not addressed the fact that this is Fallbrook.

Examples include:

**Grading:**

Grading and manufactured slopes of 65 ft, using 1.6 mill cf of cut and fill, will have an adverse visual impact and change the contour of the land.

All of the structures should use architectural elements such are rock, wood and other features that reflect the rural character of Fallbrook.

**Town Center Commercial:**

Single Story stucco buildings with max heights of 40 with limited architectural designs. This style of buildings is found in Temecula and Orange County. Buildings should incorporate more elements to reflect the rural character of Fallbrook.

**Town Center Office:**

These are modern looking two story buildings with long windowed expanses and very limited architectural details. They are out of character with the rural atmosphere. More wood, stone or other rural features should be used.

**Residential Single Family R-1:**

Much more architectural detail should be used. These appear to be non-descript tract homes. Deeper setbacks are needed to accommodate vehicles in driveways and front yards. Lots are completely out of character for Fallbrook.

**Residential Single Family R-2 & R4:**

Much more architectural detail should be used. These homes appear to be typical tract homes that lack aesthetics and architectural detail. Architectural elements should be used on the long expanses of walls.

**Multi Family Tupelo MF-41:**

These are long plain buildings that need much more architectural detail.

**Soundwalls & Fence Concepts:**

These features reflect the rural character of Fallbrook and the region but don't appear to match many of the architectural designs of the buildings.

**Recommended Project should be:****4.4 Biological Reduced Footprint Alternative**

For all the reasons stated in the DEIR.

Ms. Heyneman reported that the **Parks and Recreation Committee** had reviewed the report and had the following concerns:

1. Change development phasing by constructing parks during the first building phase rather than the 6<sup>th</sup> phase.
2. Although the space for parks including the Palomar College recreation area to be shared by written agreement meets County requirements, we feel each neighborhood park as now planned is too small to serve the number of residential units in each area.

R-1- P 2 (.5 ac) and P-5 (.2 ac) = .7 ac 50% of net- 136 d/u (4000sf lots)

R-2 –P-7 .3 ac @50% of net – 75 d/u (4500 sf lots)

R-3 – P-8 .3 ac @50% of net – 64 d/u (5000 sf lots)

R-4 - P-1 .3 ac @50% of net – 122 d/u (4500 sf lots)

R-5 – P-6 .3 ac @ 50% of net – 124 d/u (5,000 sf lots)

**TOTAL NET ACREAGE OF 6 NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS IS 2.2 (PER CP)**

P-3 1.2 ac @ 50% of net HOA Rec. center (pool, spa, 2,650 s.f. rec bldg)

Multi Purpose Recreational field 8.4 ac – 5.8 net @ 100% ( baseball , soccer fields)

3. The staging area only shows five horse trailer spaces and needs to be able to accommodate at least ten because it connects to proposed San Luis Rey River Park. The design of the staging area should also feature a drive-through to facilitate horse trailers entrance and exit.
4. Concerns were expressed about the proposed use of artificial turf with regard to cleanliness (not suitable for dog traffic), maintenance, and longevity.
5. The Parks & Recreation Committee strongly supports the Biological Reduced Footprint, Alternative #
6. 4, in lieu of the project now proposed. .

**Comments from the public:**



Mr. Ray Proctor stated that while the four million dollars the project was going to contribute to school development seemed like a lot of money, the last school built in the area cost more like 21 million dollars. Mr. Proctor felt that a school should be completely built on the site.

Mr. Wallace Tucker stated that the report seemed to be at least ten years out of date and did not address the current water and sewer related issues. **He felt that Fallbrook had already met its density commitment to the County and that no additional large developments were appropriate.**

Mr. Russell stated that there was no location **in Fallbrook** other than a few mobile home parks where lots of **less than** 6,000 square feet existed ~~in Fallbrook.~~

After lengthy discussion **Ms. Burdick motioned that all of the comments be compiled and sent to the Department of Planning and Land Use for consideration; the motion carried unanimously.**

9. Request for Waiver of "B" Community Design Review Special Area Regulations for replacement signs at EconoLube. Signs will be changed to reflect new ownership to Meineke. Location: 742 South Main. Contact: Laura Scott [laura.scott-adkins@cummingsigns.com](mailto:laura.scott-adkins@cummingsigns.com). County Planner: Debra Frischer, [debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov). **Design Review Committee**. Community Input. Voting Item. (10/2)

The owner of the business presented the request. Ms. Delaney reported that the Design Review Committee had reviewed the project and while there was some minor concern with the colors the applicant stated that they represented a company logo for Meineke Auto Service. The Design Review Group had approved the request. However the business still had unauthorized banners hanging in the service bays that would need to be brought down. The applicant promised to do so.

**Ms. Delaney motioned to approve the request subject to the banners being brought down and the motion carried with Ms. Heyneman and Ms. Dooley voting against the request.**

10. Request for Waiver of "B" Community Design Review Special Area Regulations for a site plan for a 5,000 sf refrigerated building for fruit storage. Waiver request includes comprehensive landscape design, architectural designs & elevations. Location: McDaniel Fruit Co., 965 East Mission Road, **Fallbrook**. Contact: Scott Youngren/ County Planner: Debra Frischer [debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov). **Design Review Committee**. Community Input. Voting Item. (10/2)

Mr. Youngren presented the request and stated he had worked with the **Design Review Committee** on the landscaping of the site. He further noted that the building would allow for fruit to be handled in a more **efficient** manor. This would relieve some of the truck traffic during the middle of the season.

**After limited discussion Mr. Harrington motioned that the project be approved as presented and the Group unanimously approved the motion.**

11. Request the Board of Supervisors to appoint Mr. John Crouch, 1615 E. Mission Road, H- 760-723-9698, w- 760-723-7305, F- 760-723-9069, [johnorvicki@sbcglobal.net](mailto:johnorvicki@sbcglobal.net) to the Planning Group to replace resigned member Bill Bopf. Mr. Bopf is no longer a registered voter in San Diego County and as such is no longer eligible to serve on the Planning group per Article II, Section I of Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1. Article II, Section 3 of the Bylaws of the Fallbrook Community Planning Group states, "Vacancies: Vacancies **shall** be filled from the list of candidates in the most recent election in the order of the number of votes received." In the November 2008 election Mr. John Crouch is next, "in the order of number of votes received" and he has consented to be appointed. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Russell presented the request to appoint Mr. Crouch to the seat being vacated by Mr. Bill Bopf.

**Mr. Harrington motioned that the request be approved and the Group unanimously approved the motion.**

Mr. Russell noted that comments from the County on the Fallbrook Community Plan had been received and the Group would need to go over them. The Group decided on having a special meeting to review the comments and Mr. Russell stated he would schedule the meeting facility as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.  
Tom Harrington, secretary